REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-30 and 40-42 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 10, 15-17, 22, 24, 27 and 42 are amended. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-14, 17-19, 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0024657 to Wright et al. (hereafter Wright) in view of newly-cited JP 0621722 to Hayashi. The Office Action also rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wright in view of Hayashi and U.S. Patent 6,542,897 to Lee. Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 2, 15-16, 22-23, 25, 27-30 and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wright in view of Hayashi and U.S. Patent 6,757,837 to Platt. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV, and contact information of a certain site, the proper information including a model name or a model number of the TV. Independent claim 1 also recites a controlling unit for contacting the certain site and for transmitting the proper information from the TV to the certain site in response to a checkup key signal inputted by a user, and the controlling unit for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV received from the Internet based on the proper information of the TV and the contact information. Independent claim 1 also recites that the storing unit storing the proper information of the TV prior to the controlling unit contacting the certain site. Independent claim 1 further recites that the controlling unit receives an error list of the TV from the certain site

when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, and the controlling unit automatically restores the error of the TV based on information included in the received error list of the TV.

As will be described below, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1.

Wright discloses an indicator associated with a predetermined product coupled to a product, and a web page indicated by the indicator associated with the predetermined product for providing product information. The indicator directs one to the web page where the product information is provided for the predetermined product.

Hayashi discloses a television receiver and a memory 15 for storing a serial number that shows a date of manufacture of the television receiver. See Hayashi's paragraphs [0013], [0015] and [0016].

Wright and Hayashi, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the controlling unit receiving an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, and the controlling unit automatically restoring the error of the TV based on information included in the error list of the TV, as recited in independent claim 1.

Still further, Lee discloses a customer support system including a customer support server having a customer support engine for providing customer support service with respect to a consumer product, and a database for storing product-related information to be used by the customer support engine. The system also includes a user computer including Internet communications means that can be connected to the customer support server through an

Internet. The customer support engine of the customer support server includes a gate page, as a homepage of the customer support system, for providing a menu with respect to a predetermined customer support service, and a service page for providing a customer support service, including usage guidance on a product, according to a predetermined menu selected on the gate page.

However, Lee does not teach or suggest the controlling unit receiving an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, and the controlling unit automatically restoring the error of the TV based on information included in the error list of the TV, as recited in independent claim 1.

Even still further, Platt discloses a remote server. Platt also discloses that after the remote server has received software failure information from a client computer, it stores the information in error-log files. After the information is stored, Platt may access and search a repair directory 104 for any scripts that are capable of repairing problems that can be identified based on information in the error-log files. If no repairs in the repair directory 104 correspond to information in the received error-log files, the repair server 105 saves the error-log files for later analysis and problem identification, and instructs the client computer 100 to terminate the connection and reboot itself. See Platt's col. 4, lines 8-13 and lines 37-41.

However, Platt does not teach or suggest the controlling unit receiving an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, and the controlling unit automatically restoring the error of the TV based on information included in the error list of the TV, as recited in independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Hayashi, Lee, Wright and Platt do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites receiving an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, and automatically restoring the error of the TV based on information included in the received error list of the TV.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Hayashi, Lee, Wright and Platt do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 27 recites that the television controlling unit receives an error list of the television from the Internet site when an error that occurred in the television is not a fatal error, and the television controlling unit automatically restores the error of the television based on information included in the error list of the television.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Hayashi, Lee, Wright and Platt do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 27. Thus, independent claim 27 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 42 recites that the controlling unit receives an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, the controlling unit automatically restoring the error of the TV based on information included in the received error list of the TV, and the controlling unit generates a new item about the error and adds the new item to the error list when the information for restoring the error does not exist in the error

list. Independent claim 42 also recites that the controlling unit receives a function list for describing the video or audio-related functions of the TV from the certain site when a function information menu of the TV is selected, and displays the function list of the TV.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 42. More specifically, Hayashi, Lee, Wright and Platt do not teach or suggest the controlling unit receives an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, the controlling unit automatically restoring the error of the TV based on information included in the received error list of the TV. Additionally, Hayashi, Lee, Wright and Platt do not teach or suggest that the controlling unit generates a new item about the error and adds the new item to the error list when the information for restoring the error does not exist in the error list, and wherein the controlling unit receives a function list for describing the video or audio-related functions of the TV from the certain site when a function information menu of the TV is selected, and displays the function list of the TV. Thus, independent claim 42 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10, 27 and 42 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 2 recites the controlling unit generates a new item about the error of the TV and adds the new item to the error list when the information for restoring

the error of the TV does not exist in the error list. See also dependent claim 16. The applied references (including Platt) do not teach or suggest at least these features. Thus, dependent claims 2 and 16 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-30 and 40-42 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah
Date: August 28, 2008
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

16